

## **REMARKS**

### **Summary**

Claims 1-48 stand in this application. Claims 1, 3, 13, 14, 16, 24, 25, 36, 38, 47 and 48 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the standing claims are respectfully requested.

Although Applicant disagrees with the broad grounds of rejection set forth in the Office Action, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 14, 24 and 36 in order to facilitate prosecution on the merits. Support for the amendments may be found at least on Page 22, Lines 1-13 of the application.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103**

At page 3, paragraph 5 claims 1-3, 8, 14-16, 36-38 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Publication Number (USPPN) 20070209019 ("Kaval") in view of USPPN 20020089546 ("Kanevsky"). At page 5, paragraph 6 claims 24-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaval in view of USPPN 20040155909 ("Wagner"). At page 8, paragraph 7 claims 4-7, 17-20 and 39-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaval in view of Kanevsky further in view of Wagner. At page 10, paragraph 8 claims 9-13, 21-23 and 44-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaval in view of Kanevsky in view of US 6297795 ("Kato"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections.

Claims 1-48 define over Kaval, Kanevsky, Wagner and Kato whether taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 1 recites the following language, in relevant part:

dynamically and automatically sizing cells of said plurality of active cells in response to changes in the amount of said information to be displayed in said active cells, wherein said dynamically and automatically sizing comprises adjusting a size of a first dynamically sizable active cell in response to a change in an amount of information displayed in said first dynamically sizable active cell and an amount of available space in a second dynamically sizable active cell.

Applicant respectfully submits that he has been unable to locate at least the above recited language of amended independent claim 1 in the teachings of Kaval, Kanevsky, Wagner or Kato.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kaval fails to teach, suggest or disclose the above recited language of amended independent claim 1. As correctly noted in the Office Action, Kaval fails to teach “dynamically and automatically sizing cells of said plurality of active cells in response to changes in the amount of said information to be displayed in said active cells.” Further, Kaval arguably sets different heights for display zones 24, 26. However, Kaval sets the different heights based on a type of content (list data, form data), and not on an amount of information for either of display zones 24, 26. Consequently, Kaval does not reference “an amount of available space in a second dynamically sizable active cell” as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Kaval fails to teach, suggest or disclose each and every element recited in amended independent claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Kanevsky also fails to teach, suggest or disclose the above recited language of amended independent claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kanevsky, arguably, teaches adjusting a border for a window. However, Kanevsky adjusts the border based on a length for a line of text, and fails to make any reference to another window in making any adjustments.

Consequently, Kanevsky fails to reference "an amount of available space in a second dynamically sizable active cell" as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Kanevsky fails to teach, suggest or disclose each and every element recited in amended independent claim 1. Consequently, Kaval and Kanevsky, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest every element recited in claim 1.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Wagner and Kato also fail to teach, suggest or disclose the above recited language of amended independent claim 1. Consequently, Kaval, Kanevsky, Wagner and Kato, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest every element recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Kaval, Kanevsky, Wagner and Kato whether taken alone or in combination. In addition, claims 14, 24 and 36 recite features similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14, 24 and 36 are not obvious and are patentable over the cited references for reasons analogous to those presented with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claims 14, 24 and 36. Furthermore, if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is non-obvious. *See* MPEP § 2143.03, for example. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claims 2-13, 15-23, 25-35, and 37-48 that depend

from claims 1, 14, 24 or 36, and therefore contain additional features that further distinguish these claims from the cited references.

### **Conclusion**

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-48 recite novel features not shown by the cited references. Further, Applicant submits that the above-recited novel features provide new and unexpected results not recognized by the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are not anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the cited references.

Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

It is believed that claims 1-48 are in allowable form. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 724-933-9338 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

Appl. No. 10/665,892  
Response Dated January 26, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of October 27, 2008

Docket No.: 1070P3822  
Examiner: Tran, Tuyetlien T  
TC/A.U. 2179

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to the credit card in the previously filed credit card authorization form.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC

/John F. Kacvinsky/

John F. Kacvinsky, Reg. No. 40,040

Dated: January 26, 2009

KACVINSKY LLC  
4500 Brooktree Road  
Suite 102  
Wexford, PA 15090